

THE IMPLEMENTATION OF CURRICULUM 2013: A CASE STUDY OF ENGLISH TEACHERS' EXPERIENCE AT SMA LAB SCHOOL IN INDONESIA

Yulia Nur Ekawati, M.Pd.
Pancasakti University of Tegal
Email: djoeia_ne28@yahoo.com

Abstract

The lack of the character building at schools in years becomes the focus of government to change the curriculum from KTSP (School Based Curriculum) to the 2013 Curriculum. The 2013 curriculum concerns on the students' attitude (behavior), knowledge, and skills. This study investigates the implementation of the 2013 curriculum at SMA Lab School Pancasakti Tegal. To get the data, two English teachers are observed and interviewed. The data is analyzed regarding three categorizations; (a) preparing a lesson plan, (b) applying the steps of teaching-learning activities, and (c) making an evaluation. The result shows that teachers do not implement the steps of scientific approach and the basic concept of 2013 curriculum (i.e. inquiry-based learning, project-based learning, discovery learning, problem-based learning and task-based learning) effectively since there arises students' problem, who are too passive in a class. The teachers also get problems in formulating achievement indicators and valuing students' attitude (behavior) as it is quite abstract to measure.

Key Words: Implementation of curriculum, the 2013 Curriculum

1. Introduction

The curriculum is the planned interaction of pupils with instructional content, material, resources, and processes for evaluating the attainment of educational objectives. In other definition, a curriculum is the total learning experience provided by a school. It includes the contents of courses (the syllabus), the method employed (strategies), and other aspects, like norms and values, which relate to the way the school is organized.

Indonesia curriculum changes every decade. This is caused by many factors such as the changes of society needs, the new insight of teaching learning process, political issues, development of industry and technology. The main aim of this change is as to improve the quality of teaching-learning process and learning design at school. According to some experts, the curriculum changes from time to time, both in Indonesia and in other countries, because the needs of people who every year are always evolving and the demands of the times are likely to change. Curriculum development is considered as a determinant of the future of the nation. Therefore, a good curriculum will be expected to be implemented in Indonesia that will produce the nation's future bright child with implications for the progress of the nation.

Regarding the changes of curriculum above, this study examined the implementation of 2013 curriculum made by two English teachers—Teacher A and Teacher B—at SMA Lab School Pancasakti Tegal. Specifically, this

study analyzed problems found during the curriculum implementation, the solutions provided by the teachers to solve them.

2. The Nature of Curriculum and the 2013 Curriculum Implementation

Curriculum comes from Greek, *curir* means 'runner', and *curere* means 'race'. It is then defined that a curriculum is a number of lessons which have to be done by the students to reach or get the graduation, knowledge, skill and educational. This means that one of the functions of a curriculum is to provide a design which enables learning to take place. A curriculum is more than a syllabus. A syllabus describes the content of a program and can be seen as one part of a curriculum. Moreover, when we heard the term of *curriculum*, we will think about series of courses that help students in achieving their goals in education. Marsh (2004: 1) elaborates that curriculum is (a) all planned learning for which the school is responsible, (b) all the experiences learners have under the guidance of the school, (c) the totality of learning experiences provided to students so that they can attain general skills and knowledge at a variety of learning sites, and (d) all the experiences that learners have in the course of living. From those definitions, it can be concluded that curriculum is a plan which consists of learning experiences provided to students so that they can achieve their learning purposes in terms of skills and knowledge.

In addition, Richard, Platt, and Platt (1993:94) define curriculum as an educational program which states the educational purpose of the program (the ends), the content teaching procedures and learning experience which will be necessary to achieve this purpose (the means), and some means of assessing whether or not the educational ends have been achieved. The curriculum, then, contains those aspects of program purposes, a number of learning materials which are arranged logically, learning experiences planned to change students' behavior and students' experiences which they do and feel during the lesson, teaching procedures, and assessment or evaluation.

As the curriculum orientations have moved over decades, moreover, we (teacher) should consider the important characteristics of the curriculum. Walker (1990) in Marsh (2004:7) argues that the fundamental concepts of the curriculum are (a) content that refers to maps, topics, and themes, all of which are abstractions which people have invested and named; (b) purpose that is usually categorized as intellectual, social and personal; often divided into super-ordinate purposes; stated purposes are not always reliable indicators of actions; and (c) organization of which the plan should be based on scope and sequence (order of presence over time); can be tightly organized or relatively open-ended.

Moreover, Beane *et al.* (1986) in Marsh (2004:7) states that the principles of the curriculum cover the concern of the learners' experiences, decision making about both content and process and a variety of issues and topics at many levels, and the involvement of involving many groups. From the concept and characteristics of curriculum above, it is clear that in developing the curriculum we need to decide the purpose, content and various topics. Moreover, the curriculum should concern with the learner's experiences so that learners can apply it in their daily life.

Regarding the curriculum implementation, In Indonesian context, different curriculums are implemented periodically; different stakeholder in different government era may produce a different curriculum. The changes

in the curriculum are because of the changes of needs: political and academic needs. The needs of students/learners and stakeholders are a different year by year. Therefore, some changes need to be made to fulfill the students' need. As stated in the Government Regulation of Ministry of Education and Culture in number of 58, the year of 2014, the aim of the 2013 Curriculum is to prepare the Indonesian in order to have the ability to live as individual and citizen that is faithful, productive, innovative, effective, and able to contribute to the social life, nation, country, and the world civilization. This curriculum is the next step of developing of curriculum based on competencies. The competencies, furthermore, is designed integrally with the attitude, knowledge, and skills. (Kemendikbud, 2014:4)

The 2013 curriculum is a curriculum of value which is occupied by character building. According to Mulyasa (2013: 7), the implementation of the 2013 curriculum is independent that learner can increase and use their knowledge, assess the value of character good morality in order they will exhibit positive attitudes in their daily behavior. The values are mentioned in Core Competences (*Kompetensi Inti/ KI*). These competencies contain four competencies (KI 1 to KI 4). KI 1 refers to spiritual aspects, KI 2 is for social aspects (behavior), KI 3 is designed for knowledge aspects, and KI 4 is for skills aspects. Basic Competences which is abbreviated with KD is the references to develop the competencies in indicators. In the 2013 curriculum, the teaching learning activities are based on scientific approach. The approach covers five steps, i.e. observing, questioning, gaining information, associating, and communicating. The teaching method, therefore, collaborates with the inquiry-based learning, project-based learning, discovery learning, problem-based learning and task-based learning.

This study applies a case study of the qualitative approach. The data are collected through the observations, documents, and interviews. The data analysis is furthermore presented descriptively. The participants of this study are two English teachers who are teaching at SMA Lab School Pancasakti Tegal. The data are collected through observations, documents, and interviews. The teachers are interviewed using some questions regarding with the implementation of 2013 curriculum in their school. The data are analyzed based on these categorizations: Preparing Lesson Plan, Applying the Steps of Teaching Learning Activities and Making Evaluation.

3. Results

The study reveals these important findings. ***Regarding the implementation of the 2013 curriculum***, the study shows that before implementing the 2013 curriculum, SMA Lab School Pancasakti Tegal had implemented *KTSP* since 2006. Based on this curriculum, each school is allowed to make their own syllabus and lesson plan. It tends to decentralized education. *KTSP* is developed based on the students' potential and need.

As the government changes the curriculum in 2013, this school then implemented the 2013 curriculum only in grade X. The grade XI and XII still implemented *KTSP*. The English teachers were found to be still confused about this new curriculum since they had not obtained the socialization of 2013 curriculum. They knew the curriculum based on the government letter, but they did not know the real of implementation in making lesson plan, teaching method as well arranging an evaluation. On the other hand, the

problems arise from the input of students who were not active. The ability of students was still far from being perfect. They still needed the teachers' guidance. It can be seen when the students had a discussion, solved the problems or read some texts, they still needed the teacher's explanation. They were also considered passive in a class.

Regarding the effectiveness of the 2013 curriculum implementation, data from observation and documents show that results categorized into three categorizations. **First**, in "Preparing Lesson Plan", the teachers made lesson plan before their teaching. They designed the lesson plan in order to make the teaching learning process easier. However, the lesson plan that teachers made was not appropriate to the 2013 curriculum. They stated that the lesson plan of the 2013 curriculum was so complicated. Since the complicated lesson plan, the teachers just prepared the teaching objectives and material in general. They did not make it completely.

Second, in "Applying the Steps of Teaching Learning Activities," both teachers did not apply the scientific approach and inquiry-based learning (steps i.e. observing, questioning, gaining information, associating and communicating) as it is required by the 2013 curriculum. They only used several parts of these steps such as questioning and collecting information. They used teaching methods like Cooperative Learning Method, Direct Method, and Grammar Translation Method.

The teachers started the lesson through opening session such as saying a greeting, praying, checking attendance list and reviewing the last material. The step of apperception in opening section is done by giving some questions relating the teaching material and showing some pictures or things. In Teacher A's class, for example, she brought *bakso* (meatball) to introduce the material of Procedural text. In other class, Teacher B showed pictures of Indonesian singers. In main activities, the steps of scientific approach were not implemented. They just explained the material traditionally such as using handbook, writing on a board, and having exercises. The teachers asked the students about the difficult vocabularies they found and their understanding of the material, but there was no respond (students just keep silent). They were too passive in a class since their lack ability in English.

Third, in "Making Evaluation," the 2013 curriculum tends to evaluate spiritual, social (behavioral) knowledge and skills aspects. In evaluating behavioral aspects, Teacher A said that valuing behavior in the classroom was not effective because students may have pretended to be good in front of the teacher. No students would behave badly because they know that they would be evaluated. However, students were free outside the classroom and the teacher could not watch them all the time. How could the students' honesty be evaluated and valued since it is abstract and unable to be seen clearly? Whereas, in the syllabus, the teacher is required to value the students' honesty. In another example, the teacher should evaluate whether students are grateful to have a chance to be able to learn English (religion aspect). However, there is no criterion for the evaluation. It is something complicated to be measured. Therefore, the '*Kompetensi Inti*' and '*Kompetensi Dasar*' cannot be reached effectively.

Meanwhile, to evaluate the aspects of knowledge and skill, the teachers provided spoken and written test. They also prepared the rubric of evaluation based on the competencies or skills should be valued. The

evaluation was given through exercises, assignment and project (role-play, portfolio, performances). The portfolio was delivered to gain students' understanding about material deeper as the authentic assessment.

To sum up, the 2013 curriculum had been required to be implemented by the teachers at this research site. They seemed to have tried to implement this, even though the implementation was limited to the certain level of students. However, some problems emerged during the implementation such as teachers' difficulties in understanding and constructing the lesson plan, the teachers' inability to implement the scientific approach and inquiry-based learning, and their need of the spiritual and behavioral evaluation rubric.

4. Discussions

Regarding the result above, it seems clear that teachers had not implemented the 2013 curriculum effectively yet. It can be seen from the steps of teaching that they are implemented. They did not implement the steps of scientific approach and the basic concept of 2013 curriculum (i.e. inquiry-based learning, project-based learning, discovery learning, problem-based learning and task-based learning) effectively. This is due to the teachers' lack of knowledge about the curriculum at the conceptual and implementation level. This is also caused by the input of students who are not active. They lacked the ability in English.

Based on the interview with the participants, in addition, they admitted their problems in implementing the 2013 curriculum. The problems are found in teachers' lack of in-depth understanding of formulating indicators, arranging the instruments of attitude and creating the rubric scoring of evaluation. Since the classes are large classes containing 26 students, it is difficult for teachers to observe and evaluate the students regarding their spiritual and social attitude (behavior). In evaluating knowledge and skills, the teachers provided several kinds of evaluation. The use of portfolio is one of alternative evaluation to assess students' understanding through the process.

To solve the problems especially in arranging the evaluation, teachers used software to input and help them do the scoring as well giving a report. The evaluation is not only giving a score but also describing students' strengths and weaknesses. The teachers also tried to search any information through internet or books, asked friends about implementing the curriculum and attended the workshop of 2013 curriculum. Those solutions seem not sufficient for teachers as they should always improve their teaching, make students to be active and motivate them to be a good generation. This becomes a big task for teachers.

5. Conclusions

The changes of the curriculum in Indonesia from KTSP (School Based Curriculum) to the 2013 Curriculum makes English teachers at SMA Lab School Pancasakti Tegal face challenges in implementing the new curriculum. They implement the 2013 curriculum with their lack of in-depth understanding. They prepare a simple lesson plan which is incomplete in line with the 2013 curriculum lesson plan. The teaching activities are applied starting from opening, main and close activities in general. They do not implement the scientific approach (observing, questioning, gaining

information, associating and communicating) since the students are too passive. The teachers also get difficulties in arranging an evaluation, especially in valuing attitude. They cannot create the rubric evaluation of attitude as it is quite abstract to measure. More workshops about the 2013 curriculum implementation are needed to equip the teachers with the concepts of the curriculum and experience of implementing the curriculum at a practical level.

6. References

- Ahmad, Djuwairiah. *Understanding 2013 Curriculum of English Teaching through Teachers' and Policymakers' Perspectives*. International Journal of Enhanced Research in Educational Development (IJERED). ISSN: 2320-8708. Vol.2, Issue 4, July-August, 2014. Available at www.erpublications.com accessed on 22 November 2016
- Brown, James Dean. 1995. *The Elements of Language Curriculum*. USS: Heinle & Heinle Publishers.
- Celce-Murcia, Marianne. 2001. *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. United State of America: Heinle & Heinle Thomson Learning.
- Dubin, F. & Olshtain, E. 1997. *Course Design: Developing Programs and Materials for Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jaedun, Amat. dkk. *An evaluation of the implementation of Curriculum 2013 at the building construction department of vocational high schools in Yogyakarta*. Jurnal UNY. Available at <http://download.portalgaruda.org/article.php?article=353756&val=457&title=An%20evaluation%20of%20the%20implementation%20of%20Curriculum%202013%20at%20the%20building%20construction%20department%20of%20vocational%20high%20schools%20in%20Yogyakarta> accessed on 22 November 2016)
- Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. 2014. *Materi Pelatihan Guru: Implementasi Kurikulum 2013 Tahun Ajaran 2014/2015*. Jakarta: Badan Pengembangan Sumber Daya Manusia Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan dan Penjamin Mutu Pendidikan Kementrian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Khasanah, Irma Nur. *The Implementation of 2013 Curriculum by the English Teacher and Its Barriers (A Case Study at the 10th Grade of SMA N 1 Rembang in 2014/2015 Academic Year)*. Available at <http://eprints.walisongo.ac.id/4572/1/113411021.pdf> accessed on 25 November 2016
- Larsen-Freeman, D. 2000. *Techniques and Principles in Language Teaching (2nd ed)*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Lee, W.R. 1980. *National Syllabuses Construction for Foreign-Language Teaching: Reconciling the Approaches ELT*. England: The British Council.
- Marsh, Colin J. 2004. *Key Concept for Understanding Curriculum*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Moleong, Lexy J. 2009. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Mulyasa. 2013. *Pengembangan dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Peyton, JWR. 1998. *Teaching and Learning in Medical Practice*, Manticore: Europe Ltd, Rickmansworth.
- Permendikbud No 59 Tahun 2014. *Kurikulum 2013 Sekolah Menengah Atas/Madrasah Aliyah*.

- Purbosari, Wahyu. 2015. *A Descriptive Study on the Implementation of the 2013 Curriculum in Teaching English at the Seventh Grade of SMP Negeri 5 Sragen in 2014/2015 Academic Year*. Available at <http://eprints.ums.ac.id/33158/20/PUBLICATION%20ARTICLE.pdf> accessed on 10 November 2016
- Richard, J.C & Rodgers, T.S. 1986. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press
- Richards, J.C. and Rodgers, T.S. 2001. *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sahirudin. 2013. *The Implementation of the 2013 Curriculum and the Issues of English Language Teaching and Learning in Indonesia*. The Asian Conference on Language Learning 2013 Official Conference Proceedings 2013. Available at http://iafor.org/archives/offprints/acll2013-offprints/ACLL2013_0362.pdf accessed on 25 November 2016
- Widiarti, Ketut. 2014. *The Implementation of Evaluation Standards in the Curriculum 2013*. Available at <https://ketutwidiartini.wordpress.com/2014/04/05/the-implementation-of-evaluation-standards-in-the-curriculum-2013/> accessed on 22 November 2016